

Response under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application No. 10/784,943

I. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,160,679 to Maekawa et al. ("Maekawa") and U.S. Patent No. 5,923,490 to Joyce et al. ("Joyce")

Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over the cited references. For example, claim 1 recites that a non-contact type memory device is disposed in a reel of at least one of an upper and lower flange of a tape reel.

The Examiner acknowledges that Maekawa fails to disclose the above feature, but contends that Joyce does. In Joyce, information about data recorded in a tape is recorded on the tape itself, and a position of desired data recorded in the tape can be searched according to the information. The Examiner maintains that the encoders taught in Joyce disclose the claimed memory device. However, the encoders provided in the reels 50 and 51 of Joyce are merely for emitting pulses which are then counted by the counters 52 and 53 to identify length of the tape taken upon the reel (col. 6, lines 40-51). The pulses are counted to determine positions of recordings on the tape as the tape is wound. Such encoders do not disclose a non-contact *memory* device as recited in claim 1.

Further, even if Applicant assumes *arguendo* that Joyce discloses a type of memory device, one skilled in the art would not be motivated to move the memory element 128 of Maekawa to a position in a reel. Maekawa specifically discloses that the location of the memory element 128 is so that visual observation of the element can be made from a cartridge

Response under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application No. 10/784,943

discrimination hole 45 (col. 17, line 58-col. 18, line 8). Based on the teachings of Maekawa, such visual inspection would not be possible if the memory element 128 was disposed in a reel.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over the cited references.

III. Allowable Subject Matter

As stated above, the Examiner has indicated that claims 2, 3 and 27 contain allowable subject matter.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: August 21, 2006

Respectfully submitted,



Allison M. Tulino

Registration No. 48,294